## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-15, 17, 19-26, 28-30, 41-47 and 49-70 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 9-10, 12, 19-20, 22, 28-29, 41 and 49-50 are amended; Claims 67-70 are added; and Claims 39-40 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present amendment. Support for amended independent Claims 1, 12, 22 and 41 can be found at least at p. 79 of the originally filed specification. New Claims 67-70 correspond to previously pending Claims 8, 18, 27 and 48, the features of which have been omitted from independent Claims 1, 12, 22 and 41. Claims 9-10, 19-20, 28-29 and 49-50 are amended to depend from Claims 67-70 instead of independent Claims 1, 12, 22 and 41. No new matter is presented.

In the Final Office Action of January 24, 2011 (herein, the Final Office Action), Claims 1-4, 8, 12-13, 18, 22-23, 27, 39-44 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Wu (U.S. 6,442,570); Claims 5-7, 9-10, 14-15, 17, 19-21, 24-26, 28-30, 45-47, 49-50 and 63-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wu in view of Takahashi (U.S. 6,931,531); and Claims 51-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Wu.

As an initial matter, Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the courtesy extended by Examiner Chowdhury in discussing the application with the undersigned on April 4, 2011. During the discussion, proposed claims amendments were discussed in view of the outstanding grounds of rejection. No formal agreement was reached pending the submission of a formal response to the Advisory Action issued April 14, 2011.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 12, 22 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by <u>Wu</u>. In response to this rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 1, 12, 22 and 41 recite novel features clearly not disclosed by <u>Wu</u>.

Independent Claim 41, for example, is amended to recite, in part, a personal computer having a function to transfer a subset of a plurality of pieces of content data to a portable media player connected to the personal computer, the personal computer comprising:

... an authentication unit configured to perform a mutual authentication process between the personal computer and the portable media player via the direct local connection between the personal computer and the portable media player; and

a communications interface configured to automatically transfer the subset of the plurality of pieces of content data stored in the storage medium to the portable media player via a direct local connection based on a result of the mutual authentication process performed between the personal computer and the portable media player via the direct local connection ...

Independent Claims 1, 12 and, 22, while directed to alternative embodiments, are similarly amended. Accordingly, the remarks and arguments presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 1, 12, 22 and 41.

Turning to the applied reference, <u>Wu</u> describes a synchronization system that synchronizes database objects between a portable computer 100 and a base desktop computer 102. Col. 3, l. 60 – col. 4, l. 16 of <u>Wu</u> describes that the portable computer 100 includes a portable synchronization manager 104, which is responsible for coordinating synchronization of objects stored on the portable computer 100 with objects on a base computer 102.

Wu, however, fails to teach or suggest performing authentication between the base computer 102 and the portable computer 100 prior to synchronizing the two devices. More specifically, Wu fails to teach or suggest that the base computer 102 includes "an authentication unit configured to perform a mutual authentication process between the personal computer and the portable media player via the direct local connection between the personal computer and the portable media player" and "a communications interface configured to automatically transfer the subset of the plurality of pieces of content data stored in the storage medium to the portable media player via a direct local connection based on a result of the mutual authentication process performed between the personal computer and the

portable media player via the direct local connection ...", as recited in amended independent Claim 41.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 41 (and the claims that depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn. For substantially similar reasons, it is also submitted that independent Claims 1, 12 and 22 (and the claims that depend therefrom) patentably define over <u>Wu</u>.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 5-7, 9-10, 14-15, 17, 19-21, 24-26, 28-30, 45-47 and 49-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over <u>Wu</u>, or unpatentable over <u>Wu</u> in view of <u>Takahashi</u>, each of these claims depend from one of independent Claims 1, 12, 22 and 41, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Moreover, Takahashi fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies of <u>Wu</u>.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 5-7, 9-10, 14-15, 17, 19-21, 24-26, 28-30, 45-47, 49-50 and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the comments above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application including Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-15, 17, 19-26, 28-30, 41-47 and 49-70 is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Application No. 09/889,016 Reply to Office Action of January 24, 2011

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADY, L.L.P.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 07/09) Bradley D. Lytle Attorney of Record Registration No. 40,073

Andrew T. Harry Registration No. 56,959